

## ROBBER FLY AND DRAGON FLY.

By OSMOND P. BRELAND, The University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

On August 7, 1941, at Columbus, Mississippi, the writer was walking through a field when he was attracted by the rather peculiar flight of a dragon fly. The insect was apparently floating effortlessly just above the ground with no wing motion that could be observed, and the speed was considerably slower than the usual flight of a dragon fly. Fortunately the insect came to a rest only a short distance away so that additional observation was possible. Closer examination showed to the writer's amazement, that the dragon fly had indeed not been flying under its own power, but that it had been carried by a much smaller robber fly. Unfortunately the robber fly could not be captured, but the dragonfly, which was dead, was recovered. The writer then procured an insect net, returned to the vicinity, and caught several robber flies. These were all of the same species, and the only species that was observed at this time. The specimen that had caught the dragon fly had been examined closely enough so that the writer feels confident that it was of the same or very closely related species.

The dragon fly (determined by Dr. A. B. Gurney) was *Plathemis lydia* (Drury); it had a wing spread of 70 mm., and a length of 43 mm. The collected robber flies (determined by Mr. C. T. Greene) were *Erax interruptus* (Macq.) and averaged 27 mm. in length. This was approximately the same size as the insect that had caught the dragon fly.

The writer has previously observed robber flies with insects larger than themselves, but he had never before seen one with such a large or strongly flying victim. It is of course possible that the dragon fly may have been previously injured which would have made its capture much easier. If not, however, the beginning of this episode of nature would have undoubtedly been much more interesting than its ending.

---

**Change in Name in Diptera.**—Mr. A. Earl Pritchard of the University of Minnesota has kindly informed the writers that *Neodioctria* Wilcox and Martin (*Ent. Amer. (n.s.)* 21: 7, 1941) is preoccupied by *Neodioctria* Ricardo (*Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist. (9)* 1: 58, 1918). We therefore propose the name **Nannodioctria** in place of *Neodioctria* cited above.—J. WILCOX AND C. H. MARTIN, Alhambra, Calif.